

every state and U.S. territory. These parks attract over 280 million visitors every year, for their beauty and their recreational opportunities. These figures far exceed any expectations that Presidents Roosevelt and Wilson may have had. Our National Park System is truly a triumph of American vision and commitment to responsible stewardship of our unparalleled natural heritage.

I rise today to not only emphasize the importance of our National Parks, but also to honor those who work to protect these invaluable resources. I would like to especially commend Frank Walker, who I recently met while on my family vacation to Yellowstone National Park in early August. Frank has dedicated over 39 years of his life to protecting our Nation's historical National Parks.

An avid outdoorsman and wildlife lover, Frank studied biology at the New Mexico State University. He then embarked on his career and years of service as a seasonal ranger at Yellowstone National Park in 1967, and he received his first permanent position in 1970, serving as a park technician at the White Sands National Monument in New Mexico. His success and dedication continually earned him challenging and rewarding positions all over the country. Frank has worked at the Jefferson National Expansion Memorial in Missouri, the Gulf Islands National Seashore in Mississippi, the Fort Clatsop National Memorial in Oregon, the Nez Perce National Historical Park in Idaho, and the Saguaro National Park in Arizona. After working for over two decades outside the prestigious Yellowstone National Park, Frank returned to Yellowstone in June 2001 as the Acting Superintendent, and he was promoted to his current position of Deputy Superintendent in February of 2002.

Frank has rightfully received numerous awards for his hard work and dedication to protecting our Nation's resources. These awards include the Interior Meritorious Service Award, the General Council Award from the Nez Perce Tribe, the Vail Partnership Award, the Western Region-Superintendent's Award for Cultural Resources Stewardship, and in 1985 the Southwest Region's Freeman Tilden Award.

Just as these awards have done, I want to honor Frank here today. I wish to congratulate him on his retirement and thank him for his life's dedication to our Nation's parks. It is because of his work, and the work of his colleagues, that America's resources will be enjoyed by future generations. I wish Frank and his wife, Judy, his two sons, Mark and Phillip, and his daughter, Kathy, all the luck and well-being in the future, and it is my hope that his work will inspire others to continue to protect our National Parks and other natural resources.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. LEWIS) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. LEWIS of Georgia addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. FORBES) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. FORBES addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California (Mr. SHERMAN) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. SHERMAN addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BARTON) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. BARTON of Texas addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. WAMP) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. WAMP addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BURTON) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. BURTON of Indiana addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

9/11 TRAGEDIES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 4, 2005, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MARIO DIAZ-BALART) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. MARIO DIAZ-BALART of Florida. Mr. Speaker, we have seen these past few days events to remember the tragic incidents of September 11. And, frankly, when we were reliving that tragic day, among the many things that crossed my mind was the realization that thousands of Americans died. Thousands of Americans died in their place of work for the simple sin, their only crime being that they were free people who live in a free country. They were people who love freedom, and their only crime was that that morning, like every other morning, they went to work so that they could help their family, they could feed their children, they could pay their bills, and they could continue to live and prosper in freedom.

□ 2100

Mr. Speaker, 9/11 was not the only attack against America. It was the largest attack, the terrorists' most successful attack against America, but by no means was it the only attack or the first attack against America.

The problem, Mr. Speaker, however, was that America did not realize until that horrendous wake-up call of 9/11 that there were a number of radicals around this world who had already for a generation declared war. They had declared war against the United States and our allies for the simple reason

that we live in freedom, that we cherish freedom, that women can work and live in freedom and have equal rights to men. For those reasons, there is a group of people who declared war against the United States. Not only did they declare it verbally, as they did, but they did so in actions. And again, we just didn't wake up to that realization.

When President Jimmy Carter withdrew the United States' support from the Shah of Iran, in essence facilitating and allowing the Ayatollah Khomeini to take power in Iran, he didn't realize the type of enemy we were dealing with.

More recently, in February of 1993 when the first bombing of the World Trade Center took place killing six people, the United States didn't realize who the enemy was, and we didn't fight back. But the killers persisted in trying to kill Americans.

In October of 1993, in Somalia 18 valuable, decent brave American soldiers were killed. Osama bin Laden later personally claimed credit for organizing the Somalia fighters. We didn't fight. On the contrary, we withdrew immediately from Somalia. I will quote what bin Laden said about our withdrawal. He said, "America exited, dragging its tail in failure, defeat and ruin. Caring for nothing, America left faster than anyone expected." Again, we didn't fight.

In June 1996, a truck bombing in the Khobar Towers barracks in Saudi Arabia, killing 19 Americans and we did nothing. We did not fight back. But the killers were not content. They kept trying to kill Americans.

And then in August 1998, the bombing of the U.S. embassies in Tanzania and Kenya where 224 people were killed, including many Americans, we didn't fight back. We did nothing.

In December 1999, the plot to bomb the Millennium celebrations in Seattle that was foiled when custom agents arrested an Algerian person smuggling explosives into the United States. The killers continued to persist, and we were not fighting back.

And then of course the tragic bombing of the USS *Cole* in the port of Yemen where U.S. 17 sailors were killed, and we did not fight back. But the killers were not satisfied and they continued to persist.

And then of course we got the big wake-up call, September 11, 2001, the destruction of the World Trade Center, the attack on the Pentagon where a total of 2,992 Americans were murdered on that horrendous day. Finally, America woke up to the realization that there had been a war declared on our country and our way of life and it was time that we fought back, that we started bringing justice to those terrorists wherever they may be so we would not have to fight them here on our streets, so we would not have to deal with another September 11 or another World Trade Center explosion like the first time or another attempt

on the celebrations like those in Seattle.

America started fighting back finally because we found out that these killers are not going to stop if we don't fight because that is what we always did. We didn't fight back. In many cases we withdrew. Did that appease them? No. It emboldened them, like bin Laden said.

After that then, after September 11, this President and this Congress decided to fight back and decided to remove the Taliban from power. Our brave men and women in uniform have done an incredible job under the most difficult circumstances and removed the Taliban and that which was a state sponsor of terrorism is no longer a state sponsor of terrorism, and there is a struggling democracy that is gaining ground and taking root in that land where al Qaeda used that land to plan the horrible events of 9/11.

Also on a bipartisan vote of this House and the Senate there was a vote to basically remove a state sponsor of terrorism and a threat that was Saddam Hussein. Let me read a quote from December 16, 1998 about why Saddam Hussein was dangerous and what the bipartisan attitude here in Congress was. "The hard fact is that as long as Saddam remains in power he threatens the well-being of his people, the peace of his region, and the security of the world. The best way to end that threat once and for all is with a new Iraqi government, a government ready to live in peace with its neighbors, a government that respects the rights of its people."

That was not President Bush that I quoted, that was President Bill Clinton that I quoted when he mentioned the only way was to remove Saddam Hussein.

Let me read another quote on how Congress and the country was united against international terrorism. "Saddam Hussein in effect has thumbed his nose at the world community, and I think the President is approaching this in the right fashion." That is Senator REID, the now-minority leader in the Senate.

Let me give another quote about how the country felt in a bipartisan, unified, united front against international terrorism and against that state sponsor of terrorism that was Saddam Hussein. "I can support the President. I can support an action against Saddam Hussein because I think it is in the long-term interest of our national security." That is a quote from NBC Meet the Press, Senator HILLARY CLINTON. There was bipartisan support because there was a realization that Saddam Hussein was so dangerous.

One last quote, Mr. Speaker. This is I think a very powerful quote. "It would be unrealistic, if not downright foolish, to believe we can claim victory on the war on terrorism and a more secure world if Saddam Hussein is still in power 5 years from now." That sounds like I plagiarized President Bush; but no, that was by Senator JOE BIDEN in February of 2002.

Again, as Senator JOE BIDEN said, and I think it is worthwhile reading that quote again. He mentions that we cannot claim victory, in his words, he says, "the war on terrorism and a more secure world if Saddam Hussein is still in power." JOE BIDEN understood that Saddam Hussein, a state sponsor of terrorism, the leader of that terrorism, had to go for our national security and for the fight, as he said, against international terrorism.

It saddens me to see now how the very same people who I just read their quotes who were so united, who so supported this country's efforts in the fight against terrorism, including in the fight against Saddam Hussein, recognizing that he was a major state sponsor of terrorism, where Senator BIDEN says we cannot win or claim victory. And I will quote him again. "It is unrealistic, if not downright foolish, to believe that we can claim victory on the war on terrorism and a more secure world if Saddam Hussein is still in power."

Yes, that was the consensus. So what happened? I keep hearing now the country is divided. But the President has not changed his tune. The President agrees with what these fine Members of Congress from the other party said and believed and were sure of because they were right then. The United States is the source of good for the entire world. For all of the oppressed people, we are the source of good and the source of light, the beacon of light for the entire world.

When you had a regime like the Taliban or a regime like Saddam Hussein, it was a threat to our national security, as Senator CLINTON said and as Senator BIDEN said and as Senator REID said. But all of a sudden, when things get a little bit more difficult, then all of a sudden, oh, everything they said, everything they believed in, year after year, is thrown out the window because it is election season, because it is an election year.

The reality, Mr. Speaker, is that we are at war. The reality is that we have people, men and women in uniform, in harm's way doing an incredible job. The reality is we are winning the war against terrorism, against these evil thugs who murder, have murdered and would like to continue murdering Americans if they could.

I would like to talk about some of the many accomplishments, which is why we have not had another attack on U.S. soil despite the attempts of the terrorists because of what this Congress did under the leadership, the Republican leadership and the leadership of the President.

But before I go into more detail, I would like to yield to a man who is a leader on the fight for human rights anywhere around the world where human rights are violated, the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. WAMP). It is a privilege to have you here, sir.

Mr. WAMP. I thank the gentleman for yielding, especially given the rela-

tionship I have with he and his brother because I am the middle of three sons. I have brothers on both sides of my life, and I know the bond between brothers and it is a privilege to serve with you and your brother and to fight the good fight with you.

Before I begin talking about the threats we face, the vulnerabilities that we have, and frankly the courage of the men and women in uniform that stand in harm's way on behalf of a very grateful Nation, let me first honor the sacrifices of September 11.

I was here with the leadership on the steps Monday night when a bipartisan group of Members of the House and Senate came together with extraordinary unity again to honor what happened because one of the great things I came away with on September 11 and that whole experience is that love overcomes fear, and really the only more powerful thing in the world than fear is love. Our country came together in a remarkable way. I feel even the greatest generation, which set the standard for sacrifice and courage in our country, was impressed with the bravery and the willingness to lay their life down of all of the first responders that entered burning buildings following the scriptural call that says, "No greater love hath any man than to lay down his life for a friend," and in this case lay down their life for people they never knew or would know.

We saw extraordinary heroism in the wake of September 11. That is what the character of this great Nation is all about. Just like in our own personal life, we gain our character out of these struggles. And boy, this has been a struggle. But I just want to pay tribute to all of those first responders. It seems that we still don't fully appreciate the heroism of men and women in uniform. It is not just soldiers, sailors, airmen and Marines, it is those first responders at the local level that have now stepped up in an amazing way, and so we pay tribute to that as we begin.

But I came last week on Wednesday night and talked about the threats and specifically jihadism, which is really the great threat. As I was preparing some notes to come over tonight, I saw a scroll on Fox News that today the Pope spoke out and condemned fanaticism in the Islamic world and said we must be careful of this call for a holy war. I don't want to paraphrase the Pope, but I am really grateful to see that because I asked the question when we are looking at jihadism, or what they call in other countries the Islamists, which are the radicals in Islam that promote jihadism, waging war against anyone who doesn't believe as they believe, my question for all of the religious leaders in Islam is: Where are the mullahs?

□ 2115

Where are they in condemning suicide bombers and condemning this kind of violence and condemning this full-scale assault on people and nations

that do not agree with them on their world view? That is the enemy, jihadism.

Last week I talked about how it is spreading like wildfire through Great Britain and Europe. A book called "Londonistan," talking about how jihadism has spread in London and Great Britain, calling even members of the Parliament like George Galloway by name in the book, and then his name surfaces in the conversation of the 24 hijackers who were apprehended just a month ago; talking about a book called "While Europe Slept" about other European countries that have, in the name of tolerance, just almost ignored the incredible rise of jihadism throughout Europe, and how this is a rampant problem.

Today I wanted to bring some more information to the floor from other writers that I have come across that I think is helpful.

The American Enterprise Institute, which is not exactly a conservative bastion or defender of this administration, one of their top analysts writes this, and I think it is instructive. Hamas and Hezbollah see themselves as part of a global movement of jihad. Hamas is, in fact, the Palestinian arm of the Muslim Brotherhood, founded in Egypt, with affiliates across the Muslim world. Although the Muslim Brotherhood in Egypt renounced violence in order to survive fierce government repression, it supports violence and terrorism in other places. Hezbollah was founded by Iran. These groups take pride in being the brothers and comrades-in-arms of the terrorists who attacked New York, Washington, London, Madrid, Bombay, Bali; and they celebrated when those atrocities happened.

As they also say, quite openly, they are aiming to establish a new caliphate that would create what they view as the golden age of Islam, and they want this caliphate to rule over all the lands of the Muslim empires of the past, from Morocco in Spain to the west, to the Philippines in the east, taking in the southern half of Europe, the northern half of Africa and most of Asia.

Now, as I said last week, we intercepted a letter between Zarqawi andawahiri before we killed Zarqawi. In that letter, it says exactly this, use the infidels', us, presence in the Middle East, to expand the caliphate, revive the caliphate, and they said in the letter, from Morocco to Indonesia, this same extraordinarily large territory, which they considered their rule, their empire.

So, if anyone is naive enough to think that this is all about our presence in Iraq, they are in denial. They are simply not wanting to face the facts of the threats of jihadism spreading around the world. That is really the enemy. We talk about a war on terror, but terror is a tactic used by the enemy. The enemy are the jihadists, and this is an aggressive plan. The Wall Street Journal editorialized 2 weeks

ago and said that some people have an aversion to conflict. We just don't want to face this.

I mean, 5 years after September 11, in amazing unity, and I am grateful for that, in a bipartisan way we gathered. But some people that gathered don't want to face the facts that these threats are growing. History will sort out what caused it to grow and whether things that we have done or said aggravated it. But the truth is, it is a real threat.

You know, Mr. Speaker, a very prominent Tennessean, the former Vice President of the United States, he has a movie out called "An Inconvenient Truth."

I am glad that we talk about global warming. We had a great hearing today on it and talked about nuclear energy. Even the founder of Greenpeace reported today, at our hearing, the concept of nuclear energy to reduce CO₂ emissions to clean up the global air quality and save the planet. Nuclear energy is a solution. We need to face that.

But I want to tell you about another inconvenient truth. It is an inconvenient truth that over half of the Democrats in the United States Senate voted to remove Saddam Hussein by force, and almost half the Democrats in this House voted to remove Saddam Hussein by force, and now a whole lot of them are wanting to either leave early or publicly tell the world that it was a mistake.

Now, let me tell you, when you vote to do something, you need to understand when you vote to remove Saddam Hussein, a dictator, a tyrant, a genocidal mass murderer, who had invaded other countries and had built up its guard around Baghdad to protect his empire, that it is not going to be easy, and it could be tough. It could require extraordinary sacrifice and we, as a Nation, voted to do it, and it is an inconvenient truth for them that they voted to do it, because it would be real easy just to erase that and say, oh, I don't have anything to do with that. But we agreed to do it, and why can't we, any more in this country, stand at the water's edge together when men and women are in harm's way on our behalf at this critical moment in history.

Now, let me just get to our vulnerabilities. Maybe I should come back to our vulnerabilities.

Mr. MARIO DIAZ-BALART of Florida. If I may, I would like to, because I think the gentleman from Tennessee brings up some really, really important points, I guess that some of the fine men and women on the Democratic Party side believe that if we just went away, if the United States just left the Middle East, I assume that would be stop supporting Israel, I don't know.

But if we just pulled back from the Middle East as some have said, some have said we should pull back to Japan, to Okinawa, which, by the way, in military terms for the Navy is farther away

than the Navy yards here in Virginia. So in other words if we left there, if we were just good, if we just behaved, that these terrorists would leave us alone, that they would go away.

I mentioned a little while ago a list of attacks against America that were way before 9/11, way before we were in Iraq. But I guess some just believed naively that if we just left Iraq, just left Afghanistan, that everything would be hunky dory.

Yet, I think it is important to kind of listen to what our enemy is saying. When you have Hezbollah leader Nasrallah saying, "Death to America," and let me quote him, regardless, this is a quote, regardless of how the world has changed after 9/11, after the 11th of September, death to America will remain a reverberating and powerful slogan. Death to America.

I guess some believe that he doesn't really mean it, that if we just, I don't know, retracted from the world that they would go away, bin Laden, who, by the way, very cleverly, started a media campaign to try to divide our country, very effectively, I might add. Let me quote you about that, by the way, what bin Laden said. He said, al Qaeda intends to launch a, quote, media campaign to create a wedge between the American people and their government.

He also said that the media campaign, and I am quoting him now, aimed at creating pressure from the American people on the American Government to stop their campaign. There are some that, I guess, because they are naive, are doing exactly, exactly what our enemy says that has to happen in order to defeat the United States, in order to defeat the United States.

Let us be very clear that the terrorists' aim, the aim of the terrorists is total destruction of the United States of our way of life and everything that we believe in. It is not because we may have been in Iraq; it is not because we support Israel. All those things, obviously, upset them.

But let me quote Osama bin Laden again, where he says, quote, the war is for you or for us to win, talking about the West. If we win, if we win it, it means your defeat and disgrace forever. That is how they think.

So I don't understand how, when there was such a consensus, how everybody understood that, how the terrorists continue to do the same thing, how to kill Americans, but because of the efforts of this President and this Congress, they have not been able to do so here, and the terrorists continue to say what they are going to do.

How is it possible that some refused to listen, like I guess happened in the 1930s, when some refused to listen to Winston Churchill when he said there is an evil out there, the Nazis. They are not going to go away, we have to confront them.

So I kind of pose that as a question to my colleague from Tennessee, because I don't get it, I don't get it. How

much clearer can the actions and the words of the terrorists be before some of our men and women get it, understand it. Realize that we are not the bad guys, we are the good guys. It is the terrorists that we are fighting, and they are not going to stop, they are not going to go away if we just send our troops to Okinawa and Japan and pretend that they no longer exist. I mean, I don't get it.

Mr. WAMP. I think it was General Casey who said if we leave Iraq prematurely, they will follow us home. I will finish what the American Enterprise Institute analyst said about this presence in Iraq. He said jihadists from around the world have flocked to Iraq to fight America and its allies. They believe they will win and drive the infidels from Mesopotamia, the name they use to emphasize that they have no regard for modern national identities.

If they succeed in Iraq, they say they will use it as a base from which to conquer the rest of the lands surrounding the Persian Gulf, a jumping off point for further conquest. In *Time* magazine Sunday, Max Boot writes this. He says, if we believe that wholeheartedly supporting friendly dictators works, we should remember that our support for the Shah of Iran in the 1970s and Yasser Arafat in the 1990s has taught us that secular strongmen cannot keep the lid on forever.

Either we push for change now, or we risk a fundamentalist explosion later on, and we need to be honest with the American people, to my friend from Florida, and let the people know that we have difficult days ahead. I have been on the Homeland Security appropriations subcommittee for 4 years. I have been briefed at the highest level. I have been to the United Nations, I have met with our allies from Europe and the Middle East.

I have got deeply into the issue of the nuclear threats and how terrorists are very interested in the A.Q. Kahn network, an international nuclear arms broker who is now, frankly, under house arrest in Pakistan, and how Libya gave up their nuclear weapons. The greatest threat of all is that these jihadists are able to get a nuclear weapon. We had better emphasize our security for the future of the free world.

Mr. MARIO DIAZ-BALART of Florida. Look, it is clear who our enemy is. It is clear that they have been there before Iraq, before the liberation of Iraq. Before Afghanistan, they were in Iraq. They have killed Americans for a generation. They are not going to go away if we just wish them to go away. But luckily we have had some great success. Is there a reason why there has not been an attack on American soil?

To talk a little bit about that, I would like to recognize a person who I greatly admire from the great State of New Jersey, but Mr. GARRETT has been a leader, particularly on cutting gov-

ernment waste, on fighting for the little guy for small business. I would like to recognize him. Maybe he could tell us a little bit about why we are succeeding, why we haven't had an attack. What is it that we have done that is working.

With that, I would like to yield to Mr. GARRETT.

Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey. I thank you for that. I thank the gentleman from Florida for bringing this matter to the floor tonight, and I appreciate your comment "fighting for the little guy" with regard to the economic issue, and I think we are all fighting for the little guy and the middle guy and the big guy in the sense that we want to have security here at home for America.

What I would like to do, if I may, just spend a couple of minutes speaking about some of the strides we have made in this country through the efforts of this House to make America stronger. I will touch on some of the comments made on the other side of the aisle where they are saying we have not made improvements, specifically in the area of port security.

I represent the Fifth Congressional District in New Jersey, the very top of the State of New Jersey. The people I represent in the Fifth District of New Jersey remember all too well the events of September 11. We live in the shadows, really, of the former World Trade Center as well as three major airports, the second busiest port in the Nation, Newark, and a number of national landmarks as well, such as the Statue of Liberty. So the threat of another attack in our area looms very large in our daily lives. Ensuring that government is doing its best to prevent terror attacks and prepare should the worst occur is more than just an important part of my work here in Washington.

It is a matter of life and death for my neighbors and fellow New Jerseyans. This last Wednesday I had the opportunity to tour Newark Seaport, along with U.S. customs and border protection officials. Basically, I went there to assess current procedures and technologies, since I had been there several years before, to see what they are using now to detect and prevent future threats.

While I was there, there was obviously, still, always things that we can do to make our security more airtight. But what I saw on this tour was encouraging, to say the least. You know, terrorists consistently alter their techniques and targets that keep Americans guessing where and when they might attack next and where we might be most vulnerable.

□ 2130

So that means that we must remain one step ahead of them in every facet, and the funding we have allocated towards port security has really gone a large step in that direction.

When we awoke to the very real dangers of the contemporary world on Sep-

tember 11, 2001, you can say we were shocked to discover the dangers hidden in our unsecured trade infrastructure. But today we have a layered approach to port security that has significantly increased our safety, an approach that is improving daily with the development of new tools, new technology, new methods to ensure that our trade is safe, yet as efficient as possible.

Right now, and I want to make a note of this, right now 100 percent of all containers coming into ports shipped to the U.S. receive a risk assessment. Each and every container must have a detailed manifest that accurately depicts what is being shipped in it and we know who is sending it and receiving that container as well. We also have detailed data on their shipping habits in the past and we can prioritize our inspection efforts now.

So the threat of weapons of mass destruction in the past has led to the efforts to push our borders actually out past where our borders are, all the way back to where the manufacturers who are building those items come from, whether it is in another country or another continent, all those items that come into this country for our consumption.

We now have CBP officers at 44 ports around the world. That is up from zero prior to 2001. By the end of this year, CBP will have officers at 50 ports around the world. That represents 90 percent of all the trade bound for the U.S.

These officers work with the host countries there, and what they do is they inspect the containers before they are even loaded. Then there is radiation detectors at each of these ports to ensure that the trucks entering the port are scanned for the most dangerous of weapons.

As I said before, the terrorist seeks to exploit whatever our weakest link is and find the easiest way to find access to our Nation. Our allies and trading partners have recognized the great risk to worldwide trade posed by terrorists, and they are now volunteering with our Customs Trade-Partnership Against Terrorism Plan, that is the CT-PAT.

This effort allows us to work all the way back with the shippers, the manufacturers, to secure every aspect of trade, from the factory to the railcar to the truck all the way right here to our port. So by strengthening the security before even shipping items reach our stateside ports, we make our ports dramatically safer.

This goes to a point made on the other side saying that all the security at our ports now, when it comes to items coming into our country, are done at our ports. The fact of the matter is that is absolutely wrong, what they were saying. To reiterate, 44 ports around the world right now, it is going to be up to 50 by the end of the year, 90 percent of everything coming into this country.

After the attacks on September 11, the Federal Government invested millions of dollars into new technology to

enhance our port security. Scanning equipment that was unheard of literally 5 years ago is now installed and working in each of these ports. I have seen this stuff. It is amazing.

The latest scanning technology can not only detect radiation, but it can even determine what type of radiation is present within that container by simply a single sweep of that container. It is fascinating. If you are not an engineer, as I am not, it is just amazing what they can do.

Now what they have is new technology, even newer than just a couple of years ago, and what they have done is replaced a three-step process down to a one-step process. So now the entire scan is done in one step, not three, and what this does, of course, is give the agents even more time to scan more containers.

In the State of New Jersey, where I am from, we are fortunate to have Rutgers University. What our university has done through Federal funding is establish a multi-disciplinary Port Security Laboratory and research facility, which I had the opportunity to look at as well. They are using homeland security funds to develop still better detection systems for the future in tracking container ships.

There are also private companies out there as well, besides universities. One such company is SI International. This company, that I had the opportunity to check out as well, they are engaged in some of the most amazing and greatest advances in military technology and they are turning to homeland security that I have ever seen or any of us have seen before, coming up daily with better innovations.

So I sit back not as an engineer just to marvel at this and I applaud all of the brilliant minds for their efforts to make Americans safer. As one Member of Congress, I sleep a little bit better knowing there are great minds out there that are working on these projects from a technical point of view.

We have come great strides, made great improvements since 9/11, and it is in part because of the actions of this House. Just recently, as you know, we have invested \$1.2 billion in further appropriations to go for the Security and Accountability of Every Port Act to make sure all the ports have the latest in technology, training and personnel at them.

We must agree here today that we will continue to ensure that our homeland security officials have those resources to prevent future terrorist attacks from using our global trade system ever to take lives of Americans again.

With that, I appreciate again your efforts here on the floor tonight, and applaud your work.

Mr. MARIO DIAZ-BALART of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman from New Jersey for bringing up those important points. The ports are such a huge part of our economy and the steps that have been taken to strengthen our ports.

But there is so much more that has been done, the funding for the first responders in homeland security. Through a variety of programs, these are amazing programs. Over \$30 billion in Federal funding has been allocated for the first responders since 2001.

The U.S. PATRIOT Act of 2001, which was reauthorized recently, which is obviously a key tool in preventing another domestic terrorist attack. By the way, that was a bill that was reauthorized, and 156 House Democrats voted to oppose the reauthorization of that essential tool to fight terrorism here, so the terrorism doesn't hit us here specifically.

So much more. The Homeland Security Act of 2002, which established the U.S. Department of Homeland Security as an executive department of the U.S., and tasked that department with preventing domestic terrorist attacks. That was opposed by 120 House Democrats who voted no against the creation of that department to protect the homeland against domestic terrorist attacks. Thank God, thank God, the majority prevailed and that took place.

The SAFE Port Act the Congressman just mentioned. The Intelligence Reform and Terrorism Prevention Act of 2004, which made important reforms in the intelligence community, including the creation of the Director of National Intelligence to coordinate and oversee all intelligence-related gathering. A huge issue that this Congress got done, which is why we are a little safer.

Project BioShield, which delivered \$5.6 billion, with a B, to enhance research and development and procurement and the use of biomedical countermeasures to keep us safer.

There are so many other issues that we have done, which is why America is safer now than it was before 9/11, despite the fact that many of those key pieces of legislation, the Democrats opposed them every single step of the way. They always opposed them. But we have to do more, such things as emergency communications, which we have to do better at.

The reason we have to do more, Mr. Speaker, is because the terrorists, they are not this little rag-tag group of people. They are organized. They are funded. They are out there. As a matter of fact, I understand there is a number of them meeting, state sponsors of terrorism, that are meeting really close to our shores here off the United States.

To give us an idea of who they are and what they are doing and how we have to be vigilant, I would like to now recognize the vice chairman of the House Rules Committee, the gentleman from Florida, Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART.

Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART. Thank you very much. I want to commend you and all of the distinguished colleagues who have spoken in this hour on this special order on this ultimately important matter, especially always important, but especially in this week when we recall one of the greatly tragic dates in our history.

There have been other dates in our history that have been tragic, but in terms of an attack on unarmed civilians, September 11, 2001, is without precedent in terms of not only the cruelty with which harm was inflicted that day upon thousands of families, upon our great Nation, but in a cowardly way, in this way of unfortunately the new war, the war upon values, the war upon our way of life, the war where civilians are not only fair game, but the primary objective of the enemy.

We have to learn from history in order to be able to act as effectively as possible to protect the homeland. We have to learn from history. Sometimes we even have to learn from the strangest sources, most unorthodox sources, the animal kingdom. The ostrich, for example.

The ostrich, when in fear, adopts a curious position. It hides its head in the soil. Not only by doing so does it adopt physically a peculiar position, but it diminishes its security by doing so because it has not the ability to see what is happening in its surroundings.

So even from sources as unorthodox and unexpected as the animal kingdom, specifically with the ostrich, we have to learn, because I would maintain, always respectfully, that some have adopted the position of the ostrich with regard to political positions and positions with regard to public policy, even as important as with regard to our national security. Hiding our heads in the soil, in the sand, to avoid seeing the fact that we have many enemies, is not an appropriate, not only physical position, but one that is conducive to security.

On the contrary, we have many enemies. In recent history the enemy was acting with impunity. When the enemy acted in 1993, I remember I had just arrived in this Congress, Mr. Speaker. I had just arrived and we were meeting.

I remember the Speaker-to-be Newt Gingrich, who at that time was not yet Speaker, was addressing us in a retreat in February of 1993. I had just arrived the previous month to this Congress. As he spoke, the news arrived about a dreadful terrorist attack upon civilians in New York City. I recall how then Congressman Newt Gingrich, who was to be the Speaker in the next Congress, addressed us and very calmly and with great wisdom told us that we were living in a new era, an era that included the savage attacks upon unarmed civilians by cowardly enemies. February 1993.

The reality of the matter is that the enemy saw that it could act with impunity. And the years passed, and the enemy attacked again with impunity. And the enemy attacked again with impunity, attacked American embassies in different countries with impunity. The enemy went so far as to attack a vessel of the United States Navy, killing many sailors of the USS *Cole*, inflicting great harm upon the United States.

The enemy acted with impunity. The enemy was convinced that it could continue to act with impunity, so it organized what became the most horrendous attack upon unarmed civilians in the history of the United States.

□ 2145

And the enemy was convinced that it could continue to act with impunity. The enemy miscalculated because a new day had arrived in the United States of America and thus a new day had arrived in the world. The free world led as it is, and it must be by the United States of America. The enemy miscalculated.

So from where the enemy had prepared the most horrendous attack upon civilians in history, thousands of miles away in terrorist training camps in a desolate country with a great people and a great history but a country that has suffered much, in Afghanistan.

The enemy was convinced that geography, distance, and history, especially the lessons of recent history, would continue to protect it. But a new day had arrived, and, of course, the enemy did not act on September 11, 2001, with impunity. It acted in a cowardly way but not with impunity. And the United States of America, led by the Commander in Chief, attacked the enemy in Afghanistan and subsequently attacked the enemy in Iraq.

And today the reality of the matter is that those who would like to and who dream and who, if they can, they actually plan to attack unarmed civilians in American towns and cities, those terrorists to a great extent today are occupied, trying to defeat, trying to inflict damage upon the United States Armed Forces in Iraq and our allies in Iraq, not in American towns and cities. And the fact that there has been no attack upon American civilians, American towns and cities for 5 years, the anniversary that we commemorate this year, is not by chance nor is it by luck. It is by hard work.

Mr. GARRETT, I am so glad that he spoke, whom I admire so much, like Mr. WAMP, who is here also. And Mr. GARRETT talked about the actions of this Congress. I was tasked by Speaker HASTERT in the last Congress to chair the subcommittee of the then temporary Homeland Security Committee that Speaker HASTERT created. I was tasked with the job, a difficult job, among the most difficult jobs I have ever had because it is always difficult when you are dealing with committee chairmen and jurisdiction. It is a very difficult task. But he asked me to help him to create a permanent Homeland Security Committee. And in the last Congress that was what took up most of my time, and we succeeded, with the leadership of Speaker HASTERT and with the help of the majority of our colleagues. We succeeded. We created a permanent Homeland Security Committee.

And we have taken other steps that Mr. GARRETT outlined, the PATRIOT

Act and its reauthorization and many other steps, to try to make the homeland, the people of the United States of America as secure as possible. And we are more secure. We are safer today than we were 5 years ago.

But when we see, as was pointed out, and it does not surprise me, but it is very rare to see the media talking about the fact that 90 miles from the shores of the United States this week, celebrating the fifth anniversary of 9/11, all of the state sponsors of terrorism throughout the world have gathered, and they are now gathering, receiving instructions and receiving orientation and inspiration from themselves and coordinating. They are today 90 miles from the shores of the United States. I think it is called, under the umbrella of the United Nations, the Summit of Nonaligned Countries. How interesting. Nonaligned.

You have Mr. Ahmadinejad, who does not stop in his extraordinary pursuit of the atomic weapon and publicly says that he wishes to wipe from the face of the map a democracy and friend of the United States, Israel. You have Mr. Ahmadinejad now receiving inspiration as we speak, receiving inspiration and guidance from the other state sponsors of terrorism. And, of course, the state sponsor of terrorism with all that experience, the dictator in Havana with 47 years of experience exporting terrorism, attacking the United States of America in every form and every way possible as long as he can protect his totalitarian power.

Mr. Ahmadinejad is there now, as is Mr. Chavez and all of the other state sponsors of terrorism. They are there. The North Koreans, the Syrians. You name them, Mr. Speaker, they are there.

So the enemies, our enemies, the enemies of freedom, they haven't stopped in their efforts. So we must not stop either, working to protect not only the national security of this great land but the security and the safety of the people of this great land and of all of the freedom-loving people in the world as we work to expand that sacred right of freedom that all people are entitled to, including those who are oppressed by those state sponsors of terrorism. They may be oppressed by totalitarian states, but they have freedom in their hearts and they long to be free, and they deserve our support and they always will have it.

I appreciate your convening us this evening on this ultimately important subject.

Mr. MARIO DIAZ-BALART of Florida. I thank the gentleman from Florida.

He mentioned how America had been attacked so many times with impunity, and yet some in this country still do not understand that we are at war. But listen to what our enemy is saying. Bin Laden calls the war against terrorism in Iraq the Third World War, and yet some in our country still refuse to admit that we are at war.

And he talks about how in Iraq the whole world is watching this war and the two adversaries, the Islamic nation on the one hand and the United States and its allies on the other. And he goes on to say, Mr. bin Laden does, it is either victory and glory or misery and humiliation.

What is hard for me to believe, though, is that Members of this body and of the Senate, and I think it is very important to be respectful of this institution, but there is a Member of the Senate who said that it would be unrealistic, if not downright foolish, in other words, you would be a fool, to believe that we can claim victory in the war on terrorism and a more secure world, that you would be a fool, according to this prestigious, recognized Democratic leader, if Saddam Hussein is still in power. You would be a fool is what Mr. BIDEN said. And yet now how is it possible?

I would never say that those who said that and now have changed their minds are fools. But that is what Mr. BIDEN said. You would have to be a fool to believe that Saddam Hussein could have stayed in power and we could have been victorious in the war on terrorism. And I have a hard time believing how they don't unite with the President of the United States to support our troops on the field while we are at war.

Mr. Speaker, I will now yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. WAMP. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

And I will take us through the balance of our hour here in just a couple of minutes. I want to make myself perfectly clear as we close.

The enemy is not the Democratic Party. The enemy is al Qaeda, Hezbollah, Hamas, the jihadists. They are the enemy. Our opponents here in this very healthy discussion are the Democrats. But I have to say I believe deep in my soul that the members of the minority party in Washington who believe that we should pull out of Iraq by a date certain are wrong. Senator LIEBERMAN is right; Ned Lamont is wrong. And there is disagreement in their party over this, but it is a matter of life and death, war and peace, tyranny and freedom; and Ned Lamont and that mentality is wrong. We cannot afford to fail in Iraq.

I also want to talk about our vulnerabilities briefly. The border is a vulnerability. We had testimony yesterday by Duncan Hunter, the chairman of the Armed Services Committee; and Harold Rogers, my chairman of Homeland Security appropriations, about how the southern Border is being infiltrated by people not just from Mexico and Central America but from all over the world; and it is a vulnerability for us.

But I want to say it goes unreported, underreported that tremendous progress has been made, especially in the last 12 months. We heard the testimony yesterday, crystal clear, we now do not catch and release. Ninety-nine

percent last month, certified, illegals coming across the border were detained and held to be returned to their country of origin, and the word is out. That is a tremendous deterrent, and the numbers are way down of people coming across the border. The fence below San Diego, two tiered, is making a big difference. The National Guard is making a difference. Billions of dollars having been spent is making a difference. As you heard the gentleman from New Jersey say, our ports are more secure. And most importantly, we are in the intelligence business again because that is why we failed prior to September 11.

And I want to close with this for our troops: John Stuart Mill said this: "War is an ugly thing, but not the ugliest of things." He said: "The decayed and degraded state of moral and patriotic feeling which thinks that nothing is worth war is much worse." He said: "The person who has nothing for which he is willing to fight, nothing which is more important than his own personal safety, is a miserable creature and has no chance of ever being free unless those very freedoms are made and kept so by the exertions of better men than himself."

And those people are our soldiers, sailors, airmen, and marines. And we hail them and thank them for their courage and their sacrifice.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 6061, SECURE FENCE ACT OF 2006

Mr. SESSIONS (during Special Order of Mr. MARIO DIAZ-BALART of Florida), from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 109-653) on the resolution (H. Res. 1002) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 6061) to establish operational control over the international land and maritime borders of the United States, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR THE ADOPTION OF H. Res. 1000, PROVIDING FOR EARMARKING REFORM IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Mr. SESSIONS (during Special Order of Mr. MARIO DIAZ-BALART of Florida), from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 109-654) on the resolution (H. Res. 1003) providing for the adoption of the resolution (H. Res. 1000) providing for earmarking reform in the House of Representatives, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

PERMISSION FOR COMMITTEE ON RULES TO HAVE UNTIL 2 A.M., THURSDAY, SEPTEMBER 14, 2006, TO FILE REPORT ON H. Res. 1000, PROVIDING FOR EARMARKING REFORM IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Mr. SESSIONS (during Special Order of Mr. MARIO DIAZ-BALART of Florida.) Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Rules have until 2 a.m. on September 14, 2006, to file their report to accompany House Resolution 1000.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

THE 30-SOMETHING WORKING GROUP

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. GOHMERT). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 4, 2005, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MEEK) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. MEEK of Florida. Mr. Speaker, it is an honor coming before the House once again, and I must say that I am excited about being here tonight. It is another great day in this great country of ours.

And as you know, the 30-something Working Group, we come to the floor to share with the American people, not just Democrats but Republicans, Independents, those that are thinking about voting, those that have been turned off by political processes who are thinking about being engaged in the political process once again.

To those Americans who are not registered to vote, I would encourage them to register to vote. They can still vote in the upcoming November elections because there is a lot being said on the floor, Mr. Speaker, and we talked last night, the 30-something Working Group. We took 2 hours last night talking about the initiatives that we have with our Real Security Plan, talking about the memory and the sacrifice of those that gave their lives on 9/11 and those that are still living with the effects of 9/11, whether it be losing a family member or a first responder or someone that worked in the World Trade Center or was around the plane going down in Pennsylvania or the Pentagon here in Washington, D.C., those that are still living through it.

Today we had a resolution on the floor, Mr. Speaker, that dealt with addressing the memory of those that lost their lives on 9/11 and things that we have to do. The Republican majority found it fit to kind of put in a resolution about some things that they thought that they accomplished as it relates to making America safer. Some of that I join with them on as an American and as a Member of Congress, but a lot of it has not been achieved.

□ 2200

We have the 9/11 Commission Report that came out that said that we have

to not only inspect 100 percent of cargo containers that are on ships and 100 percent of those cargo containers that go in the bellies of airplanes that are flying throughout the United States of America, it is still not accomplished today. We still have a dismal amount of Border Patrol officers to protect American borders. Democrats, we have asked for 2,000 Border Patrol officers; the President's budget request to this Congress was only 215 or 216 Border Patrol officers.

Now, the Republican majority can come to the floor night after night, day after day, do 5-minute speeches, 1-minute speeches, or take a special order and talk a good game. But I used to be a football player, Mr. Speaker, I played for Florida A&M Rattlers. I was an outside linebacker. And before the game, you would read all about what the other team is saying and all of the talking and taunting. And then you have folks that tailgate before the game, and the bus would roll in and they would talk about what they are going to do to us, and then the coach would talk about how better the other team is. But it really doesn't count until that whistle blows and that kick-off takes place and that you have an opportunity to get out there and hit somebody. And when you hit somebody and when you run the ball down the field and you end up winning the game, all of that talk was for naught.

But what is unfortunate about this situation, even though I use that analogy, Mr. Speaker, this is not a game, this is for real. This is flesh and blood. This is flesh and blood. And the bottom line is, is that one can come to the floor and talk about, well, you know, Democrats and this, that, and the other, and they are holding us back. What are we holding the Republican majority back from, Mr. Speaker? That is what I want to know. That is the prevailing question here.

The bottom line, the Republicans in this House have been in this control for double digit years. So who is holding them back? Now, let's talk a little bit about control. I want to make sure that every Member understands what control and majority means.

The majority means that any amendment, any bill, any appropriations that you want funded will be funded because you are in the majority. You have more numbers than the Democrats do at this particular time in the House.

Why are the American people saying that they want change? Why are the American people saying that they want to move in a new direction? They want to move in a new direction because they want accountability. They want oversight. They want Article I, Section 1 of the U.S. Constitution to be adhered to. They want to make sure that their vote counts here in the U.S. House of Representatives. Right now, it is just a lot of talk. And I can tell you, as a Member of the House and someone that studies what happens here on this floor and what does not happen here on this